



The City of Seattle

## Pioneer Square Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649, Seattle WA 98124-4649

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

PSB 54/19

**MINUTES** for Wednesday March 13, 2019

### **Board Members**

Adam Alsobrook, Vice Chair  
Lynda Collie  
Kianoush Curran  
Brendan Donckers  
Carol O'Donnell  
Emma McIntosh  
Alex Rolluda, Chair  
Felicia Salcedo

### **Staff**

Genna Nashem  
Melinda Bloom

Chair Alex Rolluda called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

...

### **031319.22      Nugent Building** 407 2<sup>nd</sup> Ext S

Alterations to the storefront

Staff report: Ms. Nashem said the Board reviewed this application at ARC Jan 9, 2019. This was an after-the-fact application, for work that was done by the previous tenant that is no longer there. The building owner, now the applicant, has worked with staff to get the work that was done without a Certificate of Approval and without the permission of the landlord resolved. The ARC wanted to see an alternative door that was more in character with other storefront doors and that provided more transparency. They thought the door was not compatible with the building as it was a residential style door and the art deco style was not fitting with the design of the building or the era of the building. The ARC also wanted to further understand the construction of the stained-glass piece that was installed in the area of purple glass in the transom area. There is currently a wall installed behind it so would need some interior demolition to explore.

The applicant has a couple different configurations of a new door system and has done the exploratory demolition that reveals that the purple glass had been removed to install the stained glass. This makes the likelihood of it being repaired less likely or at least more complicated than other repairs that have been made in the District when the frame was intact. If the tenant had come to the Board, the Board might have preferred repairing the purple glass over removing it and installing a salvaged stained-glass panel, if repair was determined not possible, the Board might have explored a different alternative to the installation of the stained glass. Considering the current condition, they should consider the risk to the remaining glass if the stained glass were removed. The Board could make it clear through discussion that this would not have been to preferred resolution but is being approved to prevent risk to the remaining purple glass prisms.

Applicant Comment:

Boris Castellanos provided photos of the damage that had been done and said the tenant didn't inform anyone of what he was doing and then filed for bankruptcy. He said he now has a new tenant. He provided drawings for the new front door – either double or single door option. He said the aluminum storefront doors that were there before were broken. He said he has searched for replacement glass for the purple pieces that were removed and would purchase that if he could find it. He said the window used to hold an air conditioner unit and plywood from an earlier tenant.

Mr. Rolluda noted the one sidelight and two sidelight door options.

Mr. Castellanos said either will work but he preferred the one door. He said the double doors were too small. He said ARC reviewed storefront conditions, door options, and how to proceed with upper section.

Board members discussed the issue with the door and the stained glass that were installed without approval. Board members determined less damage would be done to historic fabric if the newly installed stained glass was left as is, removing it may cause further damage.

Mr. Alsobrook noted that the applicant provided additional information requested by ARC.

Mr. Castellanos said it was beefed up, structurally reinforced; the carpenter did a good job.

Mr. Donckers asked the applicant to speak to the risk he understood to be by taking the stained glass out.

Mr. Castellanos said it is a risk; the glass came in glass panels with a frame around. He said that if they carefully take that apart and remove the stained-glass panel, they could re-install the same type glass that was there and there would not be a big risk, just some.

Mr. Donckers said the stained-glass is very strange.

Mr. Castellanos said he would suggest replacing it from the front.

Mr. Donckers was concerned this could incentivize tenants with proceeding with no approval

Mr. Castellanos said if the tenant was still there. He said this is going to cost \$10,000 if we don't want it to stand out. He said they could put wood there to match trim.

Mr. Alsobrook said ARC mentioned wood window restoration and asked if he talked to contractors.

Mr. Castellanos said he hadn't.

Mr. Alsobrook noted a company that restored the leaded glass at the Publix; they are ardent preservationists and teach classes as well. He said he thought the window issue was reversible per SOI 9 and 10. He said the aesthetics of the stained-glass panel are not consistent with the building. He suggested working with contractor to reinforce existing and install new panel with leading. He said salvage is too difficult. He said it could be taken out and clear glass installed. He said this work was inappropriate as well as how they went ahead and did it; he said this provides a path forward to clean it up. He said the tile bulkhead is appropriate and the anodized aluminum storefront door meets Code. He suggested review of installation of glass panel while investigating permanent preservation and then come back to board. He said the prisms are rare and may be available in other parts of the country. He said they are individual blocks put together with cane.

Mr. Castellanos said he is happy to do that; he will get bid and is on wait list.

Mr. Alsobrook said not to do fake purple; the original glass was clear when installed but due to flaw turned purple with sun exposure. He said from a technical perspective this is reversible. In future, review appropriate replacement in appropriate panel.

Mr. Castellanos said he will.

Mr. Rolluda went over District Rules. He agreed with Mr. Alsobrook's approach. He said the bulkhead tile is OK and door with one sidelight is OK. He said to hold off on transom for now.

Mr. Donckers appreciated the recognition of good faith to move forward.

Ms. Curran agreed.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Action: I move to recommend granting a Certificate of Approval for Alterations to the storefront to replace the unapproved art deco residential door that was installed without approval and replace it with a new anodized aluminum storefront door system with one sidelight and to allow the stained-glass windows to remain pending investigation of appropriate replacement option for stained glass panel in transom but to have the trim painted to match the storefront paint color.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on considering the application submittal and Board discussion at the March 6, 2019 public meeting and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

Code Citations:

SMC 23.66.030 Certificates of Approval required

Pioneer Square Preservation District Rules

III. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION

In addition to the Pioneer Square Preservation District Ordinance and Rules, The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation with Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, and the complete series of Historic Buildings Preservation Briefs developed by the National Park Service shall serve as guidelines for proposed exterior alterations and treatments, rehabilitation projects, and new construction. (7/99)

Rehabilitation is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values. (7/99) In considering rehabilitation projects, what is critical is the stabilization of significant historical detailing, respect for the original architectural style, and compatibility of scale and materials.

Secretary of Interior's Standards

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

MM/SC/AA/BD                      6:0:0    Motion carried.

Mr. Donckers asked the relationship between the building tenant and the building owner.

Ms. Nashem explained that applications require both tenant and property owner signature. He said the tenant didn't end an application; the first was a rough concept; the next was half complete. She said she copied Mr. Castellanos on correspondence and the tenants had already done the damage. She said it was a renegade applicant who didn't follow process.

...

**031319.5                      BOARD BUSINESS**

**031319.6                      REPORT OF THE CHAIR:** Alex Rolluda, Chair

**031319.7                      STAFF REPORT:** Genna Nashem

Genna Nashem  
Pioneer Square Preservation Board Coordinator  
206.684.0227